



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/937,246	09/21/2001	Claudio Bernoni	BUG 2 0144	6473

7590 10/17/2003

Fay Sharpe Fagan Beall
Minnich & McKee
Suite 700
1100 Superior Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114-2518

EXAMINER

JULES, FRANTZ F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3617

DATE MAILED: 10/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/937,246

Applicant(s)

BERNONI, CLAUDIO

SW

Examiner

Frantz F. Jules

Art Unit

3617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the neutral axis of the wall of the groove" in line 16-17.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim as a neutral axis has not been previously defined.

Claims 2-6 are rejected as being dependent upon rejected base claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaji (US 4,466,670) in view of Broring et al and Hayashi (US 5,096,264).

Claims 7-10

Kaji discloses a three piece wheel for a motor vehicle, said wheel comprising: an outer rim, an inner rim, and a disc, wherein a portion of said outer rim is abutted with said inner rim and compressed between said inner rim and said disc, and;

first and second sets of through-holes defined respectively in said disc and said outer rim, said first and second sets of through-holes registered with each other; and registered with said first and second sets of through-bores; and, a plurality of fasteners for connecting said outer rim, said inner rim, and said disc to each other to define a wheel, said plurality of fasteners each comprising a portion that projects through an aligned pair of through-bores of said first and second sets of through-bores and into one of said threaded blind bores of said inner rim, wherein said outer rim is defined from a non-cast alloy plate material. And wherein at least one of said inner rim and said disc are each defined by a cast member.

Kaji discloses all of the features as listed above but does not disclose a three piece wheel comprising a set of threaded blind bores defined in said inner rim for receiving the fastener and wherein said outer rim is defined from a different material as compared to at least one of said inner rim and said disc. The general concept of providing threaded blind bores in the inner rim of a wheel for receiving fastener to secure a component is well known in the art as illustrated by Hayashi which discloses in fig. 10 the use of threaded blind bores in the inner rim of a wheel for receiving fastener. Also, the general concept of providing different material for the outer flange of a wheel as compared to the rest of the wheel is well known in the art as illustrated by Broring et al which disclose the use of a wheel being made of different material in flange area as compared to the rest of the wheel. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kaji to include the use of threaded blind bores in the

Art Unit: 3617

inner rim of his wheel for receiving fastener to secure components of the wheel as taught by Hayashi in order to prevent loosening of the fastener as threaded connection is stronger than loose connection. In addition, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kaji to include the use of different material for the outer flange of the wheel as compared to at least one of the inner rim and the disc in his advantageous three piece wheel as taught by Broring in order to provide material with emergency-running properties capable of withstanding the load of the car in the event of a flat tire.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 1-6 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 09/03/03 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 3617

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Cook et al are cited to show related three piece wheel having an outer flange portion sandwiched between a disc and inner flange of a wheel.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frantz F. Jules whose telephone number is (703) 308-8780. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph S. Morano can be reached on (703) 308-0230. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

Frantz F. Jules
Examiner
Art Unit 3617

Application/Control Number: 09/937,246

Page 6

Art Unit: 3617

FFJ

October 15, 2003



S. JOSEPH MORANO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 8000